

Exhibit 8

Whitfield, Maureen

From: Whitfield, Maureen
Sent: Wednesday, August 30, 2017 3:42 PM
To: Sechesan, Adrian:(ComEd)
Cc: RICHARDSON, DARYL:(ComEd); PARKS, DARYL A:(ComEd); PATEL, TARAL:(ComEd); MITCHELL, DARRYL:(ComEd); Sayles, Markeis:(ComEd)
Subject: RE: Red tags - feedback -
Attachments: TB-17-083 Pole Tagging Awareness.pdf

Importance: High

Daryl, Daryl, and Taral -

RESURFACING - Please advise as to your position on who will bear the cost of replacement if a red tagged pole is targeted for use by Crown.

Thank you

MAUREEN A. WHITFIELD
Manager, Utilities Relations
Small Cell & Fiber Solutions
T: (724) 416-2791 | M: (724) 914-7818

CROWN CASTLE
2000 Corporate Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317
CrownCastle.com

From: Sechesan, Adrian:(ComEd) [mailto:adrian.sechesan@ComEd.com]
Sent: Friday, August 25, 2017 6:02 PM
To: Whitfield, Maureen <Maureen.Whitfield@crowncastle.com>
Cc: RICHARDSON, DARYL:(ComEd) <Daryl.Richardson@ComEd.com>; PARKS, DARYL A:(ComEd) <Daryl.Parks@ComEd.com>; PATEL, TARAL:(ComEd) <Taral.Patel@ComEd.com>; MITCHELL, DARRYL:(ComEd) <darryl.mitchell@ComEd.com>; Sayles, Markeis:(ComEd) <Markeis.Sayles@ComEd.com>
Subject: RE: Red tags - feedback

Maureen,

Attached is the latest document on pole tagging.

Adrian

From: Whitfield, Maureen [mailto:Maureen.Whitfield@crowncastle.com]
Sent: Friday, August 25, 2017 3:51 PM
To: Sechesan, Adrian:(ComEd)
Cc: RICHARDSON, DARYL:(ComEd); PARKS, DARYL A:(ComEd); PATEL, TARAL:(ComEd); MITCHELL, DARRYL:(ComEd)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: Red tags - feedback

Adrian

PUBLIC VERSION

It was suggested that you may be the best resource from which to obtain a legend of red tags and their meaning for ComEd poles. Can you please provide?

Daryl and Daryl – please advise of your current approach as to when ComEd will absorb costs of replacement vs. when Crown would be billed.

Thank you

MAUREEN A. WHITFIELD

Manager, Utilities Relations
Small Cell & Fiber Solutions
T: (724) 416-2791 | M: (724) 914-7818

CROWN CASTLE

2000 Corporate Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317
CrownCastle.com

From: Whitfield, Maureen

Sent: Tuesday, August 22, 2017 12:44 PM

To: taral.patel@comed.com; Richardson, Daryl:(ComEd) <Daryl.Richardson@ComEd.com>; Parks, Daryl A:(ComEd) <Daryl.Parks@ComEd.com>

Cc: Aranda, Mario:(ComEd) <mario.aranda@ComEd.com>; Maru, Teshome:(ComEd) <Teshome.Maru@ComEd.com>; Neris Jr, Jesus:(ComEd) <Jesus.NerisJr@ComEd.com>; Matusiewicz, David A:(ComEd) <David.Matusiewicz@ComEd.com>; Faessel, Carla (Vendor) <Carla.Faessel.Vendor@crowncastle.com>; Columbia, Jennifer (Vendor) <Jennifer.Columbia.Vendor@crowncastle.com>

Subject: Red tags - feedback

Gents

In our meeting on 8/9 we discussed red tag poles and replacement guidelines.

Can you please provide:

- Legend of types of red tags (are there different tags/symbols for each so that Crown can ascertain the nature of the red tag?)
- Action required for each
 - When must the pole be replaced?
 - When can we attach?
 - When is the replacement cost borne by ComEd?
 - When would the replacement cost be borne by Crown?

Thank you!

MAUREEN A. WHITFIELD

Manager, Utilities Relations
Small Cell & Fiber Solutions
T: (724) 416-2791 | M: (724) 914-7818

CROWN CASTLE

2000 Corporate Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317
CrownCastle.com

Whitfield, Maureen

From: Whitfield, Maureen
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2017 8:41 PM
To: taral.patel@comed.com; darryl.mitchell@comed.com
Cc: Rajamani, Karmen; Sirohey, Fahd (Fahd.Sirohey@crowncastle.com)
Subject: Red tag poles - strategy discussion

Darryl and Taral

As you will recall, a few weeks back we discussed the red tag pole replacement process and I advised I would be reaching out to Daryl Richardson to see what information may be available to Crown in order to identify red tag poles along our designed routes.

In speaking to Daryl, he indicated that the data was not in a format that would allow for us to overlay against our designs in order to minimize areas requiring significant redesign and/or make-ready.

Further, he indicated that ComEd's policy would not allow for bracing or other means of reinforcing red tag poles, regardless of the nature of the red tag, but rather replacement is the only viable option.

Given these circumstances, we think it would be of mutual benefit to discuss and develop a cost sharing approach to encountered red tags. Crown should not neither be expected to shoulder the full financial burden of replacing every encountered red tag pole due to the above noted challenges nor are we excited at the prospect of redesigning our routes once well into the application process, once we find out significant red tag pole replacements are required. (The level of churn and wasted effort on application processing and walkdowns alone could be enormous). On the other hand, ComEd would benefit from a more expeditious replacement program without shouldering the full cost, and have the added benefit of highlighting to the ICC these efforts at bettering your system integrity and reliability.

I am planning to be in Chicago on Monday and Tuesday 10/16 – 10/17. I'm happy to come to your offices to discuss. Please advise of your availability.

Best Regards-

MAUREEN A. WHITFIELD
Manager, Utilities Relations
Small Cell & Fiber Solutions
T: (724) 416-2791 | M: (724) 914-7818

CROWN CASTLE
2000 Corporate Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317
CrownCastle.com

Whitfield, Maureen

From: Whitfield, Maureen
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2017 9:11 AM
To: darryl.mitchell@comed.com
Subject: fiber routes - pole replacements
Attachments: CN Fiber routes_MR assessment and pole replacements_10092017.xlsx

Importance: High

Darryl

As discussed, attached is my quick analysis of the poles identified for replacement in a grouping of fiber applications in Chicago North.

As you can see, approximately 1/3 of the poles applied for have been identified for replacement. While the detail doesn't specify the reason for replacement, this volume raises significant concern as we're assuming a large number are due to red tags.

Given that we have traditionally seen bills in the \$10,000-\$15,000 range for a pole replacement, we're talking over \$3 million in pole replacement costs for only a portion of the fiber applications submitted.

As requested, I will contact Daryl Richardson's team to try and get detail surrounding the nature of the replacements – as I must admit this is a bit of sticker shock.

Thank you

MAUREEN A. WHITFIELD
Manager, Utilities Relations
Small Cell & Fiber Solutions
T: (724) 416-2791 | M: (724) 914-7818

CROWN CASTLE
2000 Corporate Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317
CrownCastle.com

Whitfield, Maureen

From: Whitfield, Maureen
Sent: Wednesday, November 8, 2017 5:24 PM
To: 'isaac.akridge@comed.com'; darryl.mitchell@comed.com
Cc: Rajamani, Karmen; Cabe, Brian; Sirohey, Fahd (Fahd.Sirohey@crowncastle.com)
Subject: Crown Castle and ComEd meeting on 11/2 - summary

Gentlemen

My apologies for the delay in sending out this summary – I had a few days’ vacation scheduled and just returned to the office.

Please note, we have provided this same summary to Chairman Sheahan as per his request.

Should you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me at either number listed below.

ComEd Attendees:

- Isaac Akridge – VP Distribution Operations, Chicago Region
- Darryl Mitchell – Director, Engineering and Work Management, Chicago Region
- Taral Patel - Manager, Regional Engineering and New Business
- Darryl Richardson – Manager, New Business, Chicago North
- John Prueitt – Director, Engineering
- Joe Gilchrist – Manager, Real Estate and Facilities
- Scott Kish – Retail Rates

Crown Attendees:

- Brian Cabe – Vice President and General Manager, Central Region
- Fahd Sirohey – Regional Director, Implementation, Central Region
- Karmen Rajamani – Regional Director, Network Real Estate
- Christopher Szafoni - District Manager, Chicago
- Maureen Whitfield - Manager, Utility Relations

Agenda:

- Wireless rates:
 - Scheduled meeting on 12/5 to discuss rate proposal
- Red Tag poles:
 - ComEd provided overview of their pole inspection program
 - 12% pole fail each year
 - 5% are scheduled for replacement
 - 7% are only replaced when touched
 - ComEd and Crown agreed to schedule follow up discussion on red tag locations and ComEd’s quarterly replacement schedule
 - Additional analysis pending on anticipated red tag poles encountered and whose financial responsibility it is to replace
- Attachment Application Processing
 - ComEd provided revised construction completion schedule
 - Make-ready estimates pending for work to be completed in November

PUBLIC VERSION

- Call scheduled for 11/15 between Darryl Mitchell and Fahd Sirohey
- Agreed to schedule additional discussion on best practices in anticipation of pending volume increase

Most Sincerely-

MAUREEN A. WHITFIELD

Manager, Utilities Relations

Small Cell & Fiber Solutions

T: (724) 416-2791 | M: (724) 914-7818

CROWN CASTLE

2000 Corporate Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317

CrownCastle.com

Exhibit 9



Crown Castle
2000 Corporate Drive
Canonsburg, PA 15317

October 25, 2018

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Mr. Vito Martino
VP Distribution Operations – Chicago Region
Commonwealth Edison
7601 S. Lawndale
Chicago, IL 60652

Re: Request for Executive Level Negotiations of Pole Attachment Dispute

Dear Mr. Martino,

As set forth below, this letter constitutes Crown Castle NG Central LLC's ("Crown Castle") request for a final executive level negotiation to seek to resolve ongoing disputes between Crown Castle and ComEd regarding ComEd's pole attachment rates, terms, and conditions in Illinois.

Specifically, Crown Castle seeks to have an in-person meeting to be attended by representatives of ComEd who have sufficient authority to make binding decisions on behalf of the company regarding the subject matter of the following issues regarding Crown Castle's attachment to ComEd-owned poles in Illinois.

Attachment Rates for "Wireless" Equipment – ComEd charges Crown Castle [REDACTED] per pole for wireless equipment attachment. That rate is unjust and unreasonable in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 224. Pursuant to the formula adopted by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC"), the maximum annual rate that ComEd may charge per foot of usable space occupied is \$12.57.¹ Wireless equipment is protected by Section 224 and the FCC's regulations. The [REDACTED] annual charge exceeds by over [REDACTED] times the maximum lawful per foot rate and is clearly unrelated to ComEd's costs. ComEd has been overcharging Crown Castle by similar amounts for years, going back to at least 2010.

Crown Castle demands that ComEd amend its wireless attachment rate for wireless attachments. For purposes of this discussion, Crown Castle will agree that its wireless attachments to ComEd poles in Illinois occupy 6 feet of useable space (including safety clearance). Accordingly, the maximum annual

¹ The FCC's Rules govern Crown Castle's attachments to ComEd poles in Illinois because even though the Illinois Commerce Commission has "certified" that it regulates pole attachments, that certification and the ICC's rules apply only to attachments by cable television operators. The ICC has not adopted rules governing attachments by telecommunications providers, and accordingly, jurisdiction over such attachments remains with the FCC. See e.g., *Implementation of Section 703(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Report and Order, CS Docket No. 97-151, 13 FCC Rcd 6777, 6781 n. 20 (Feb. 6, 1998); see also *Implementation of Section 703(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, CS Docket No. 97-151, 12 FCC Rcd 11725, 11727 n. 13 (Aug. 12, 1997). The \$12.57 calculation is based on the pole "equivalent" count provided by ComEd, the rate of return found in the ICC website, and ComEd's FERC Form 1 for the year-end 2016, and applying the Commission's telecom formula and FCC presumptions for urban attachments.

per pole fee that ComEd can charge is [REDACTED] times 6 or [REDACTED] per pole. Crown Castle also demands that ComEd agree to refund Crown Castle [REDACTED] for overpayments going back to 2010 (based on a per pole regulated rate of [REDACTED]).

Access to and Payment for “Red Tagged” Poles – As you know, ComEd has a policy pursuant to which it refuses to allow Crown Castle to attach (fiber or wireless) to ComEd poles that have been “red tagged” by ComEd unless and until Crown Castle first pays to have the red tagged poles replaced. Although ComEd has never fully explained or justified the basis for red tagging certain poles, it is clear, at a minimum, that the red tagging status is based on pre-existing conditions that are unrelated to Crown Castle’s proposed attachment. It is unjust and unreasonable for ComEd to require Crown Castle to pay to correct or fix conditions that are not directly caused by its proposed attachment. The FCC has repeatedly held that pole owners cannot impose the cost of correcting issues that were not caused by the new attaching party. Indeed, the Commission has clarified its long held position that “new attachers are not responsible for the costs associated with bringing poles . . . into compliance with current safety and pole owner construction standards to the extent such poles . . . were out of compliance prior to the new attachment.” *Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment*, Third Report and Order and Declaratory Ruling, FCC 18-111, WC Docket No. 17-84; WT Docket No. 17-79 ¶ 121 (Aug. 3, 2018) (emphasis added) (“OTMR Order”); *see also Knology, Inc. v. Georgia Power Co.*, Order, FCC 03-292, 18 FCC Rcd. 24615, ¶ 37 (Nov. 14, 2003) (ordering an investor-owned utility to refund an attacher for “costs of any change-outs necessitated by the safety violations of other attachers. . .”). Indeed, in the OTMR Order, the Commission further explained:

Although utilities have sometimes held new attachers responsible for the costs of correcting preexisting violations, ***this practice is inconsistent with our long-standing principle that a new attacher is responsible only for actual costs incurred to accommodate its attachment.*** The new attachment may precipitate correction of the preexisting violation, but it is the violation itself that causes the costs, not the new attacher. Holding the new attacher liable for preexisting violations unfairly penalizes the new attacher for problems it did not cause, thereby deterring deployment, and provides incentives for attachers to complete make-ready work irresponsibly and count on later attachers to fix the problem. This is true whether the make-ready work that corrects these preexisting violations is simple or complex.

We also clarify that utilities may not deny new attachers access to the pole solely based on safety concerns arising from a pre-existing violation . . . Simply denying new attachers access prevents broadband deployment and does nothing to correct the safety issue. We also clarify that a utility cannot delay completion of make-ready while the utility attempts to identify or collect from the party who should pay for correction of the preexisting violation.

OTMR Order at ¶¶ 121-122 (emphasis added).

Accordingly, ComEd is prohibited from requiring Crown Castle to pay to replace or correct conditions on red tagged poles. ComEd must provide Crown Castle access to all poles, including red tagged poles, pursuant to the timeframes required by the FCC's Rules. The cost of any make-ready required to correct pre-existing conditions on red tagged poles is the responsibility of ComEd and/or the party that caused the conditions. Crown Castle is not liable for the cost of correcting such conditions.

Crown Castle demands that ComEd immediately begin processing Crown Castle's pending and future pole attachment applications for red tagged poles pursuant to FCC timelines and without imposing the cost of correcting red tagged poles on Crown Castle. Crown Castle also demands that ComEd agree to refund Crown Castle \$5,675,109.65 for red tag pole replacement costs paid through early September along with any additional accumulated charges paid thereafter until such charges cease as a condition of attachment.

Attachment Rate For Fiber Optic Lines – As noted above, the maximum annual per foot per pole rate ComEd can charge for telecommunications equipment in 2018 based on the FCC's formula is \$12.57 (that calculation is based on the pole "equivalent" count provided by ComEd, the rate of return found in the ICC website, and ComEd's FERC Form 1 for the year-end 2016, and applying the Commission's telecom formula and FCC presumptions for urban attachments). For Crown Castle, ComEd's 2018 invoices sought [REDACTED] per solely owned pole and [REDACTED] per jointly owned pole. Crown Castle also now owns Sunesys and Lighttower. For Sunesys, ComEd's 2018 invoices sought [REDACTED] per pole regardless of pole ownership. For Lighttower, ComEd's 2016 invoice sought [REDACTED] per pole regardless of ownership. Those annual attachment rates are unjust and unreasonable under Section 224, the FCC's regulations, and Section 11.1.1 of the Pole Attachment Agreement between Crown Castle and ComEd (which provides that for fiber attachments the rate will be calculated in accordance with the Federal Communications Commission's rate formula applicable to attachments of telecommunications providers"). Accordingly, Crown Castle demands that ComEd adjust its rate for fiber attachments to \$12.57 per pole for 2018 and agree to refund [REDACTED] for overpayments going back to 2010 or such year in which Crown Castle acquired Sunesys and Lighttower.

Pursuant to Rule 1.1404(k) of the FCC's Rules, Crown Castle seeks to have the requested executive level meeting before November 6, 2018. Please respond to this letter and provide potential dates when ComEd authorized executives can be available.

Sincerely,



Brian Cabe
VP General Manager
(724) 416-9902
brian.cabe@crowncastle.com

From: Whitfield, Maureen [mailto:Maureen.Whitfield@crowncastle.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 06, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Gilchrist, Joe T:(ComEd); vito.martino@ComEd.com; mark.falcone@ComEd.com
Cc: Koukola, Kimberly A:(ComEd); Cabe, Brian; Hussey, Rebecca; Millar, Robert; Thompson, Scott
Subject: Executive Level Meeting Request - Additional Delivery Methods

[EXTERNAL]

Hello,

On October 25, 2018, Crown Castle posted for delivery to Vito Martino, via USPS Certified Mail, the attached correspondence requesting an executive level meeting between ComEd and Crown Castle. The Certified Mail tracking number associated with the correspondence is 70173040000109284903.

The tracking feature of www.usps.com reveals that delivery was attempted on October 31, 2018; however, no signature was procured and, as such, a notice was left at 7601 S. Lawndale, Chicago, IL 60652, designating where the Certified Mail can be picked up. It is unclear whether the correspondence has been picked up by a ComEd representative at this point. Please see the attached tracking summary, printed this morning via USPS, stating the status of the Certified Mail.

In order to avoid additional failed delivery attempts, Crown Castle is hereby emailing a copy of the correspondence and is also forwarding a written copy of the correspondence via overnight courier today for delivery tomorrow, November 7, 2018.

Please kindly acknowledge the receipt of this email. Crown Castle respectfully requests a response by Friday, November 9, 2018 as to whether ComEd intends to engage in an executive level meeting on the issues detailed in the attached correspondence.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Respectfully,

MAUREEN A. WHITFIELD
Manager, Utility Relations
Small Cell Solutions
T: (724) 416-2791 | M: (724) 914-7818

CROWN CASTLE
2000 Corporate Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317

11/20/18

Mr. Brian Cabe
VP General Manager
Crown Castle
2000 Corporate Drive
Canonsburg, PA 15317

Dear Mr. Cabe:

This responds to your letter to Mr. Martino dated October 25, 2018, in which Crown Castle requests an executive-level meeting to resolve pole attachment disputes that have arisen between our companies. As you might know, the letter was incorrectly addressed and re-sent, so that we received it on November 7, 2018.

I look forward to meeting with you and I am available the following dates in our Oakbrook Terrace, Illinois office at 2 Lincoln Centre, Oakbrook Terrace, Illinois: December 4 (morning), December 5 (morning) and December 6 (afternoon).

Your letter alleges violations of Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") regulations, even though the regulation of pole attachments has rested exclusively with the Illinois Commerce Commission ("ICC") for many years. In 1978, the ICC certified to the FCC that it regulates pole attachments, thus preempting the entire field of pole attachments in accordance with the federal Pole Attachment Act. The fact that the ICC's "reverse preemption" grants it exclusive jurisdiction over pole attachments is evidenced by the 1996 Telecommunications Act and subsequent FCC rulings, none of which required states to re-certify following the expansion of FCC jurisdiction in "FCC States," and by the fact that not a single state did re-certify following the 1996 Act. Further, as recently as a few months ago, the Commission was actively engaging both parties on pole attachment issues raised by Crown.

ComEd's attachment rates were negotiated with Crown in good faith under the long-established policy of the ICC, and reflect fair rates established by arm's length negotiations. Although the rates exceed what Crown speculates that FCC rates might be, the FCC has never calculated a wireless attachment rate and the ICC has not adopted FCC guidelines in any event.

As for Crown's claims about "red-tagged" poles, the ICC has never made a ruling about such poles, and ComEd's practice is commonplace in the industry.

Even assuming FCC jurisdiction, your October 25 letter mistakenly interprets recent FCC rulings. The FCC's August 3, 2018 Pole Attachment Order restated a "long-standing principle" that attachers need not pay to correct pre-existing violations and clarified that utilities cannot deny access "solely" based on pre-existing safety concerns. But the FCC had never before addressed the issue of "red-tagged" poles, so its "red-tagged" pole ruling is brand new. Even if FCC rules were relevant in Illinois, the FCC's new "clarification" on this issue would not apply anyway, since ComEd denies access to red-tagged poles not "solely" for safety reasons, but instead for both safety and capacity reasons. The FCC also needs to square its August 3 rulings about pre-existing violations with the Pole Attachment Act and Section 1.1408(b) of its own rules, since its August 3 "clarifications" are at odds with both, as explained in the reconsideration petition filed last month by the Coalition of Concerned Utilities.

Finally, ComEd is not sure whether Crown is providing any telecommunications service at all on each and every one (or indeed any) of the ComEd's poles to which Crown is attached. As we all know, construction companies do not have pole attachment rights.

I look forward to addressing Crown Castle's concerns during our meeting and hope to resolve this matter to our mutual satisfaction. Please let me know which dates work for you and if anyone else from Crown will be joining you.. I do not think legal counsel is needed for this meeting, but please let me know if Crown disagrees so I may plan accordingly.

Sincerely,



Mark A. Falcone

Exhibit 10

Whitfield, Maureen

From: Whitfield, Maureen
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2017 7:34 PM
To: 'Alonso, Manny:(ComEd)'
Subject: RE: Telecom Forecast Predictions

Are these the numbers you were thinking of when we were discussing earlier today?

If so, I need to apologize – I was thinking holistically and didn't account for the fact that a percentage of the nodes were on non-ComEd poles with respect to our "Phase 3" work. The wireless estimates I sent you below are indeed a bit high – but this afternoon when I mentioned 1250 that was for Phase 3 only. We still have another 100ish apps we still need to submit for Phase 2 and we have other projects as well in Chicago so I think the estimate would be 2000 for 2018 rather than 3000.

Wireline and service connections are still reasonable.

MAUREEN A. WHITFIELD
Manager, Utilities Relations
Small Cell & Fiber Solutions
T: (724) 416-2791 | M: (724) 914-7818

CROWN CASTLE
2000 Corporate Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317
CrownCastle.com

From: Whitfield, Maureen
Sent: Monday, October 9, 2017 5:36 PM
To: Alonso, Manny:(ComEd) <manny.alonso@ComEd.com>
Subject: RE: Telecom Forecast Predictions

Sorry for the delayed response - your numbers are light - I would suggest

Wireline -
2018= 500
2019 = 200

Wireless:
2018 = 3000
2019 = 400

Service connections:
2018 = 2500
2019 = 800

Thanks
MAUREEN A. WHITFIELD
Manager, Utilities Relations
Small Cell & Fiber Solutions
T: (724) 416-2791 | M: (724) 914-7818

CROWN CASTLE
2000 Corporate Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317

PUBLIC VERSION

CrownCastle.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Alonso, Manny:(ComEd) [<mailto:manny.alonso@ComEd.com>]
Sent: Monday, October 9, 2017 9:34 AM
To: Whitfield, Maureen <Maureen.Whitfield@crowncastle.com>
Subject: RE: Telecom Forecast Predictions

Wireline ~250

Wireless ~500

For next two years. Does this approximation agree with yours?

-----Original Message-----

From: Whitfield, Maureen [<mailto:Maureen.Whitfield@crowncastle.com>]
Sent: Friday, October 06, 2017 6:45 PM
To: Alonso, Manny:(ComEd)
Cc: Rajamani, Karmen
Subject: Re: Telecom Forecast Predictions

Manny

You can assume our current volumes to be sustained for the next 2 years.

We don't have visibility any further out than that.

Hope this helps-let me know if you need anything further

Maureen Whitfield
Crown Castle
Manager, Utility Relations
Desk: 724-416-2791
Cell: 724-914-7818

On Oct 6, 2017, at 6:16 PM, Alonso, Manny:(ComEd) <manny.alonso@ComEd.com<<mailto:manny.alonso@ComEd.com>>> wrote:

Maureen,

A quick forecast will do. Need overall service accounts for NB and wireline and wireless applications for RE for at least two years. ComEd is trying to resource levelize the upcoming two years and budget accordingly.

Thanks,
Manny

From: Whitfield, Maureen [<mailto:Maureen.Whitfield@crowncastle.com>]
Sent: Monday, October 02, 2017 12:45 PM
To: Alonso, Manny:(ComEd)
Subject: RE: Telecom Forecast Predictions

When do you need this information?

MAUREEN A. WHITFIELD
Manager, Utilities Relations
Small Cell & Fiber Solutions
T: (724) 416-2791 | M: (724) 914-7818

CROWN CASTLE
2000 Corporate Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317 CrownCastle.com<<http://www.crowncastle.com/>>

PUBLIC VERSION

From: Alonso, Manny:(ComEd) [<mailto:manny.alonso@ComEd.com>]
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2017 1:17 PM
Subject: Telecom Forecast Predictions

Hello,

ComEd is requesting a forecast for the next two to five years. ComEd would like the information broken down by approximately how many applications are specifically for third party attachments (antennas/fiber) and how many will be direct request for service on non-ComEd infrastructure. These forecasts will assist ComEd with resource levels. As always, ComEd will treat all information received as confidential.

Information needed...

- * Overall number of application requests by year for 5 years.
- * Number of third party pole applications.
 - o Fiber/Cable
 - o Antenna
- * Number of service requests for non-third party attachments (non-ComEd infrastructure).

Respectfully,
Manny Alonso
Real Estate Infrastructure Management
ComEd Three Lincoln Centre, Oakbrook Terrace, IL 60181
* (630) 437-2214 Fax (630) 437-2223
* manny.alonso@exeloncorp.com<<mailto:manny.alonso@exeloncorp.com>>

This Email message and any attachment may contain information that is proprietary, legally privileged, confidential and/or subject to copyright belonging to Exelon Corporation or its affiliates ("Exelon"). This Email is intended solely for the use of the person(s) to which it is addressed. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivery of this Email to the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this Email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and permanently delete this Email and any copies. Exelon policies expressly prohibit employees from making defamatory or offensive statements and infringing any copyright or any other legal right by Email communication. Exelon will not accept any liability in respect of such communications. -EXCIP This email may contain confidential or privileged material. Use or disclosure of it by anyone other than the recipient is unauthorized. If you are not an intended recipient, please delete this email.

This email may contain confidential or privileged material. Use or disclosure of it by anyone other than the recipient is unauthorized. If you are not an intended recipient, please delete this email.

Whitfield, Maureen

From: Whitfield, Maureen
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2018 11:03 AM
To: taral.patel@comed.com; Richardson, Daryl:(ComEd); Parks, Daryl A:(ComEd)
Subject: wood utility node pole apps - ph 3 schedule

See below for monthly schedule..

2018	
Qtr2	
May	120
Jun	120
Qtr3	
Jul	120
Aug	120
Sep	120
Qtr4	
Oct	120
Nov	120
Dec	120
2019	
Qtr1	
Jan	120
Feb	120
Mar	45

Grand Total 1245

MAUREEN A. WHITFIELD

Manager, Utility Relations

Small Cell Solutions

T: (724) 416-2791 | M: (724) 914-7818

CROWN CASTLE

2000 Corporate Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317

CrownCastle.com

Whitfield, Maureen

From: Whitfield, Maureen
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2018 10:48 AM
To: michael.mann@comed.com
Subject: Crown forecasts

Michael

I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. I've been working to try and get some clarity on our upcoming work.

At this juncture, the current "Phase 3" volumes remain in tack and despite a delayed start, we are now full throttle and expect the application submissions to flow for the next 4-6 months:

For node apps on wood utility poles:

2018	
Qtr2	
May	120
Jun	120
Qtr3	
Jul	120
Aug	120
Sep	120
Qtr4	
Oct	120
Nov	120
Dec	120
2019	
Qtr1	
Jan	120
Feb	120
Mar	45

Grand Total 1245

NOTE: The above does NOT include "service only" load letters that will be submitted for sites being placed on streetlights or traffic signals. We anticipate approx. 1055 of these locations that will require service.

Associated fiber application projections are as follows. We expect to average 45-50 applications per week:

May	231
June	165
July	168
August	171

We do have an additional 500 sites in the pipeline as well for various other projects. We expect applications to start being submitted in 4th QTR 2018.

PUBLIC VERSION

Finally, we are hearing that there are an additional 2500 sites on the horizon [REDACTED] We anticipate that [REDACTED], the applications would likely start hitting the ComEd pipelines in 2019. Unfortunately, I have no further specific detail to share at this point. However, if additional details become available I will certainly share.

Thank you

MAUREEN A. WHITFIELD

Manager, Utility Relations

Small Cell Solutions

T: (724) 416-2791 | M: (724) 914-7818

CROWN CASTLE

2000 Corporate Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317

CrownCastle.com

Whitfield, Maureen

From: Whitfield, Maureen
Sent: Monday, September 10, 2018 10:53 AM
To: taral.patel@comed.com; darryl.mitchell@comed.com
Cc: Sirohey, Fahd (Fahd.Sirohey@crowncastle.com)
Subject: 2019 application submission forecast
Attachments: Crown 2019 App submission forecast_09102018.xlsx

Taral

Sorry for the delay. I had a huge firedrill last week. Here is the updated forecast. I've added a confidence level for a project that is in our sales pipeline that is still being worked.

Hope this is helpful.

Thanks

MAUREEN A. WHITFIELD
Manager, Utility Relations
Small Cell Solutions
T: (724) 416-2791 | M: (724) 914-7818

CROWN CASTLE
2000 Corporate Drive, Canonsburg, PA 15317
CrownCastle.com

PUBLIC VERSION

Crown Castle

Application Submission Schedule 9/10/2018

Confidence level	# of Apps	Sep-18	Oct-18	Nov-18	Dec-18	Jan-19	Feb-19	Mar-19	Apr-19	May-19	Jun-19	Jul-19	Aug-19	Sep-19	Oct-19	Nov-19	Dec-19
	Ph 2 node	20	20	20													
	Ph 3 Node	200	120	150	120	150	100										
	NCS - ph 1	60	100	60													
65%	NCS - ph 2					125	125	125	100	100	100						
50%	NCS - ph3								125	125	100	100	40				
	Ph 2 fiber	5	5	5													
	Ph 3 fiber	110	250	285	285	20	9	13	32	14	4	9	9	7	5		
	NCS - ph 1			25	25												
65%	NCS - ph 2					25	25	25	25	25	25						
50%	NCS - ph3								75	75	75	75	75				
	TOTALS	3,877	395	495	545	345	259	163	357	339	304	184	124	7	5	0	0

NOTE: The above totals for NCS sites are NOT reflective of the number of service connections needed. The majority will be colocated on existing/active node sites so an additional service connection is not needed

Exhibit 11



1/12/2018

ComEd & Crown Castle – Chicago Projects

ComEd Service Territory

The Foundation for a Wireless World.

Agenda

- ComEd Application Processing
- Expenses and Fees
 - Red Tag Poles
 - Attachment Fees
- Other
- Next Steps

Application processing

Expectations

Application review 45 days	Make Ready Estimate 14 days	Estimate Payment 1-14 days	Complete Make Ready 90 days	Permit Issued Max time elapsed: 150-160 days
<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Real Estate - intake•New Business – walk down estimate•New Business – walk down	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•New Business – customer agreement for Make Ready	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Crown Castle – Approve and issue payment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ComEd crews or outsource to qualified contractor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•New Business completes task; Real Estate updates perpetual inventory and issues permit

Expectation: Applications processed within established timeframes

Application Processing – 2017 experiences

2017 Submissions – 150 day timeline

	Node	Fiber	Total
Total apps submitted	301	238	539
Permits due by 12/31	269	201	470
Due and received by 12/31	187 (70%)	145 (72%)	332 (71%)
Shortfall	82	56	138
Permits received by 12/31	196	153	349
Issued by 12/31 but not due	9 (196 – 187)	8 (153 – 145)	17

Application Processing – 2017 experiences

YE Completion Commitment – Oct 2017

	Node	Fiber	Total
Target	169	163	332
Permitted	88 (52%)	118 (72%)	206 (62%)
Shortfall	81	45	126

Application Processing – 2018 – Ph 2 and Ph 3

Phase 2 – forecasted permits due

Phase 2 – forecasted permits due	Node	Fiber	Total
Jan- current	23	17	40
<u>2017 carryover (net of 1/5 approvals)</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>63</u>
Total	57	46	103
Feb	0	3	3
Mar	0	7	7
April	0	1	1
May	0	1	1

Phase 2 and 3 – forecasted application submission schedule

	Est. Pole Qty	# of Apps	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Ph 2 node	56	56	56											
Ph 3 Node	1,225	1,225	-	80	160	160	160	160	160	160	160	25	-	-
Ph 2 fiber														
Ph 3 fiber	18,000	1,192	-	-	75	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	67	-
TOTALS	19,281	2,473	56	80	235	310	310	310	310	310	310	175	67	-



Expenses and Fees

Red Tag Poles

- ComEd identifies deficient poles through their “red tag” process
 - Several categories that indicate severity
- ComEd has stated that their policy requires any red-tagged pole that is “touched” must be replaced; reinforcement/repair is not an option regardless of the severity of the deficiency
- ComEd cannot and/or will not provide locational details regarding identified red tag poles
- Crown, as both a wireless services provider and a ratepayer, does not believe it should be unduly burdened with the full cost of replacing each previously identified and deemed deficient pole it encounters.
 - Applying current Phase 2 replacement rates to Phase 3, and assuming 50% of those to be replaced are due to “no touch” red-tags, at approx. \$13,000 per pole, the price tag is approximating [\\$41 million](#) alone
 - Crown should not be burdened to shoulder the full financial cost resulting in a windfall to ComEd in terms of significantly less capital spend realized while obtaining a significant system upgrade



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Next Steps

Thank You

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION
PLEASE CONTACT:

Maureen Whitfield
Manager, Utility Relations
(724) 416-2791
Maureen.Whitfield@crowncastle.com